in Madras and that our rates might be brought into line with Madras rates.

Reply of Government.—The practice in British India will be ascertained and the representation considered.

Subject No. 37.

The abolition of Central Nazir system.

Mr. A Ramanna.

Summary of Discussion.—The present Central Nazir system is a failure as processes are not served in time. The results of this are complicacy in accounts and dissatisfaction among the litigant public owing to unnecessary adjournments or closing of cases without the production of necessary evidence. All the Judges have no hold upon him as he is a subordinate to only one of them. There is a Deputy Nazir in every Court and with the existing establishment of process servers the revival of the old system and the abolition of the office of the Central Nazir will produce better results.

Mr. Ramanna said that rules were all right. But they are not enforced strictly and promotions are not given to deserving men, nor accounts and duty registers properly kept. 15 out of 64 peons are employed on guard and other duty. Then there are left 49, or 10 for each taluk. This number is quite ample if each man serves about 250 instead of 360. But many of these peons are otherwise employed. Only 26 really do serving work. Rotation is not properly carried out. The rules should also be revised in certain respects and strictly enforced before considering the question of the abolition of the system.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under consideration, and any suitable changes needed will be made in the rules.

Subject No. 38.

Attachment of movable properties in connection with decrees from Civil Courts.

Mr. Hedase Devara Sastri of Koppa Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—The amins charged with the execution of Civil Court decrees while attaching movable properties of defendants (Judgment-debtors generally bring with them persons deputed by the plaintiffs and take inventories without sufficient description of properties, with the result that, before sale, they are replaced by inferior articles. Such properties fetch very low prices and cause loss to the defendants. To put a stop to this it is requested that the amins may be required to take the inventories before the patel, the shanbhog and landholders, not less than three in number of the village in which such property is found and affix some distinguishing mark on each of the articles attached, giving at the same time a copy of the inventories to the defendants.

Reply of Government.—The proposal is impracticable unless the amins are empowered to enforce the appearance of the shanbhog and patel and three landholders. Such proceedings will greatly delay execution of decrees. The Chief Court have recently issued a rule of practice for giving an inventory of attached moveables to the judgment

debtor and will also issue orders for amins giving a sufficient description of properties in inventories.

Subject No. 39.

Sales of immovable property connected with decrees of Civil Courts.

Mr. Nadig Sivappa, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—By conducting sales of immovable property in execution of decrees of Civil Courts by Amins, the defendants (Judgment debtors) are subjected to heavy loss and deception. It is therefore solicited that such sales of Civil Courts may be ordered to be conducted by Revenue Officers.

Reply of Government.—This subject was brought up in 1903. The proposal appears to be impracticable. The Revenue Commissioner's views, however, have been called for.

Subject No. 40.

Sureties for attached movables.

Mr. Bhaskara Rao, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—When sureties for attached movables do not produce the same, the parties are compelled to bring a suit against them. This increases litigation. Provision may therefore be made in the Civil Procedure Code to enable the parties to proceed against the sureties after decree on the execution side. This was represented last year to which a reply was given that the matter would again be brought to the notice of the Chief Court. It is requested that early orders may be passed on the subject.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

Subject No. 41.

Early disposal of appeals in Chief Court.

Mr. Krishna Iyengar of Turuvekere Sub-Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—Appeals are dragged on in the Chief Court for 6 or 7 years and parties are put to great loss thereby. Arrangements may be made for early disposal of appeals.

Reply of Government.—The Chief Court may be relied upon to expedite disposal of cases.

Subject No. 42.

Reduction of Small Cause jurisdiction of certain Sub-Judges' Courts.

Mr. Subba Rao.

Summary of Discussion—The Small Cause jurisdiction of the newly constituted Sub-Judges' Courts (at Chitaldrug etc.,) which is fixed at Rs. 300 may be reduced to Rs. 100 like those of Bangalore and other places, as the parties are denied the right of appeal in cases disposed of by them within Rs. 300, which is the general limit of money transaction.

Mr. Nagappa's proposal refers to the Sub-Judge's Court at Chitaldrug.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under consideration.

Subject No. 43.

Small Cause jurisdiction, of Sub-Judges.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Row, B. A., L. L. B., Advocate, Shimoga Municipality.
Mr. C. Subba Row, Advocate, Nagar Sabha.

Summary of discussion.—The pecuniary jurisdiction of the Sub-Judges in Small Cause cases may be reduced from Rs. 300 to Rs. 100 as the transactions in the moffusil are between sowcars and the raiyats; this jurisdiction causes hardship in the case of the latter. Small Cause jurisdiction will be best exercised in dealings between persons of equal status and opportunities, as between a merchant and a merchant at Bangalore.

Reply of Government.—*Vide* subject No. 42.